THEOLOGY

VOL. LVIII FEBRUARY, 1955 No. 416

Editorial Notes

WE are reviving in this issue "Letters from the Church overseas"—a feature of THEOLOGY that had to be suspended during the war owing to paper restrictions and difficulties of communication. Thanks to the industry of our editorial representative in the U.S.A. and his collaborators, we have throughout been able to continue the publication of "American Letters", and we know that they have been much appreciated. They will still appear, but less frequently in future, so as to admit the inclusion of periodical letters from other parts of the world. We have invited our correspondents abroad to report and comment on matters of theological interest in their area of the Church, e.g. noticeable trends in theological opinion, significant controversies, proposals for church reform, the relation between church and society, etc. We have also expressed the hope that they will not eschew astringency in their comments!

* * * * *

We recently expressed the opinion that the difficulty of giving a straightforward answer to the question "what constitutes membership of the Church?" or "what is a practising churchman?" is not peculiar to Anglicanism or to English-speaking Christianity. An interesting article entitled "Qu'est-ce qu'un catholique pratiquant?" by Abbé A. Ryckmans in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* (November 1954, pp. 965–72) is evidence of the difficulty that a candid Belgian Catholic finds in trying to answer the question. As he says, "practising" may mean either outward compliance with certain religious duties, e.g. attendance at Sunday mass, or a real endeavour to live the Christian life, and there is a great difference between these two types of "Christian". His conclusion is that in Belgium—and other countries too—a large majority of those who are "practising" in the former sense are not "practising" in the latter sense, which is the sense that matters. The problems of church membership are not of course the same in England as in Belgium, but this article shows how complicated are the inquiries that have to be set on foot everywhere before any plain statement on the subject can justifiably be made.

* * * * *

The *Crockford Preface 1953–54* has, in accordance with a suggestion we supported when reviewing it, now been issued as a separate pamphlet (Oxford University Press, 2s. 6d.).

* * * * *

The Saving Name, by the Rev. Hedley Hodkin (S.C.M. Press, 7s. 6d.), contains two dozen little essays on Christian faith and practice, which first appeared in the parish magazine of Holy Trinity, Millhouses, Sheffield. They are marked by a distinction of thought

and expression which is seldom encountered in parish magazines. Not only the editors of those important organs of communication, but preachers also, should study Mr Hodkin's art; they will enjoy doing so.

* * * * *

An Anglican Year: commemorative readings based on the Kalendar of the Church of England, by the Rev. Donald A. Foster (Skeffington, 5s.), contains suggestions for meditation and intentions for prayer for each Sunday in the year and also for each red-letter and black-letter saint's day. The book is of handy size and may be found useful by some lay-folk in preparing for Holy Communion. The idea is a good one though the execution is rather commonplace. We had hoped to find that the readings were appropriate passages extracted from the works of Anglican and other divines

* * * * *

In July 1947 we published a review of a psychological study of Blake by the Rev. W. P. Witcutt. He was at that time a Roman Catholic priest. In *Return to Reality* (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d.) he explains how he was originally drawn to Roman Catholicism through the influence of the extreme distributists, and then how, during his training for the priesthood, he became absorbed in the scholastic philosophy and theology. The subsequent story of how the scholastic system eventually failed to satisfy him, and of how he came to return to the Church of England, is well and sensitively told and without controversial animus.

* * * * *

We were much struck by Mr S. B. Jackman's first novel, *A Portrait in Two Colours*, when it was published a few years ago. He is now the Congregationalist minister in Pretoria, and in his new book—*The Numbered Days* (S.C.M. Press, 9s. 6d.)—he comes before us as a preacher and a prophetic preacher at that. He brings the themes of divine judgment and mercy to bear upon the desperate situation in South Africa with great courage and confidence. If Mr Jackman had been at Evanston he would certainly have sided with the continentals on the subject of hope. He is quite sure that Western civilization is doomed not only in South Africa but everywhere. We apprehend that he is probably right about South Africa; he is less convincing when he generalizes about world forces that are more remote from his own experience. Moreover, though he draws his message from the Bible, we do not think he has weighed all that the Bible says or implies about terrestrial values, and he assumes too easily that the Church, when true to itself, must always be a gathered minority. Nevertheless, this is a powerful essay in reading the signs of the times.

* * * * *

The Summons to Unity, by Dr R. P. C. Hanson (Edinburgh House Press, 5s. and 3s. 6d.), should be useful to groups embarking on a study and discussion of reunion. It opens with a statement of the arguments *against* unity, and then proceeds to answer them. There

follows an account of the development of the ecumenical movement and an estimate of its future prospects. Dr Hanson is Hon. Secretary of the Faith and Order Department of the British Council of Churches, and that fact indicates where his interests chiefly lie.

* * * * *

It is sufficient recommendation of *More Letters of Herbert Hensley Henson* (edited by E. F. Braley, S.P.C.K., 15s.) to say that it is quite as good as the volume previously published. On almost every page there is something worth thinking about and memorably expressed. Here are one or two sayings we marked. "That Christianity should do its work in the world by slightly touching a large area, and intensely moving a small one, seems to be the testimony of history." "In my judgment, by far the best instrument of teaching is exegesis." "I think the wives of the clergy ought to be ineligible for the National Assembly. They can hardly express anything but what is felt and thought from the clerical point of view." Most of the letters in this volume were written during the Durham episcopate, and many of them reveal Henson as an admirable *pastor pastorum*.

* * * * *

Our attention has been called to an editorial in *Faith and Unity* (September 1954) in which it is stated that the tendency of THEOLOGY in recent years "has been markedly towards Continental Protestantism". We find this statement surprising and diverting because, if anyone wishes to know, we have been much more influenced, ever since we came to years of theological discretion, by Continental Catholicism than by Continental Protestantism. Certainly, we feel a larger indebtedness to Continental Catholicism than to the kind of "Anglo-Catholicism" represented in *Faith and Unity*. The only evidence there cited for our marked tendency towards Continental Protestantism is that during the last world-war in our capacity as editor of the Christian News-Letter Books we invited Professor Karl Barth to write a letter to the English people. We recall that we also successfully invited the late Mr Eric Gill to contribute a book to the same series. We must presumably be prepared for this fact to be cited in another quarter as evidence of a marked tendency on the part of THEOLOGY towards Roman Catholicism. That would be equally sensible and equally far-fetched.

Religion and Beauty[1]

I

"WORSHIP and the Arts": What is Art? Here is a tentative definition: The answer furnished by human skill to the soul's thirst for Beauty. It is because the Church has been indifferent to this un-

[1] A paper read at the Conference on Worship and the Arts at Oxford in July 1954.

appeased and unappeasable thirst for Beauty that so much of our religion is drab and so many pople are alienated from its worship. The "pious" (in all epochs, and especially since the Renaissance) have often been suspicious of Beauty. In our own day this suspicion has been fostered by a dislike of the aesthetes of the "nineties", with the glib talk of the "greenery-yallery" young men and their nonsense of "art for art's ake", and by a healthy revulsion from the contemporary cult of ugliness which passes for art. The fact that we find ourselves in this Conference at least shows that we are disturbed in our minds by this divorce of Beauty from Religion, and are determined to establish a better state of things, in which Truth shall be seen in its Beauty, and Beauty be shown as an aspect of Truth. "Ye shall be witnesses unto me", said our Lord; and if the witness of the Church's worship is misleading, how grave is this defect and how gross a disservice it does to him who (in the words of the Apocrypha) is "the first author of beauty".

If Art is concerned with Beauty, what is Beauty? Unless we have an intuitive clue to that in our own minds the study of aesthetics won't greatly help us, any more than the study of harmony will help the tone-deaf man to appreciate the beauty of music. There are some things we must know before they can be explained. When St Augustine was pressed to answer the question "What is time?" he answered, "When nobody asks me, I know." And the same may be said about Beauty. When Aquinas declares, "Beauty is that which pleases when it is seen", he leaves us no wiser than before: rather, more perplexed, for his reply would apply equally well to the Sistine Madonna or to a "nice cup of tea". Nearly all the philosophers have tried their hand at a definition of Beauty; but we are little nearer to a satisfying solution when all has been said. "When nobody asks me, I know." We all possess an instinct for Beauty, even though we may express it in strange ways. We are all convinced that some things are beautiful and others ugly, though we may be unable to provide a reasoned explanation for our aesthetic judgments.

This fact of our spontaneous reaction to the lure and challenge of Beauty is of prime significance in our estimation of human nature, and points to the intimate connexion between Beauty and Religion. It is an evidence of our immortal dignity, and part of the differentia which separates us from the lower animals. It belongs to the mighty "surplus" that makes us men. The distinction between the human and the sub-human is that the animals' resources are all occupied with the effort to live, whereas man has a "surplus" to be expended on other quests—science, philosophy, art, and religion. The animal is a utilitarian: man has the freedom of an infinitely larger world. He has a fund of energy which is not exhausted in the effort to live, but inspires him to reach out after treasures of another world—Truth, and Goodness, and Beauty—the ultimate values; and he is restless and unsatisfied except when busy with this pursuit. Aldous Huxley in his latest book, *The Doors of Perception*, once again calls attention to the fact (overlooked by the Darwinians) of how different is the animals' sense of the objects which seem beautiful to us. "For

certain animals it is biologically very important to be able to distinguish certain hues, but beyond the limits of their utilitarian spectrum most creatures are completely colour-blind. Bees, for example, spend most of their time 'deflowering the fresh virgins of the spring', but they can only recognize a very few colours. Man's highly developed colour-sense is a biological luxury, inestimably precious to him as an intellectual and spiritual being, but unnecessary to his survival as an animal."

A man's value is evidenced by what he thinks valuable; and his discovery of the three "ultimate values" is the proof that he himself is of incalculable value. The worth of our lives as personal beings depends on our threefold relation to fundamental Reality—moral, intellectual, and aesthetic; and if we are to be fully integrated and balanced none of them must be ignored or denied. Beauty, Truth, and Goodness, though distinctive, are not distinct. They are as inseparable as the Persons of the Blessed Trinity; and if one member suffer loss the other members suffer with it. Mr Clutton Brock said, "Each of them has, as it were, the scent of the others about it, and is incomplete without them. . . . Beauty, we say, cannot lie; righteousness cannot be ugly; truth can do no wrong."

II

Hence the mistake of the late-Victorian cry of "Art for art's sake". "Art for art's sake is simply art that is turned inwards upon itself instead of outwards upon the real and eternal world. . . . It seems difficult to doubt that as a matter of fact the greatest works of art have been produced within the framework of a definitely otherworldly outlook." So Prof. John Baillie. And to support his contention he quotes Paul Claudel: "Art for art's sake is not a creative doctrine at all. Do you believe for a moment that Shakspere, or Dostoievsky, or Rubens, or Titian, or Wagner, did their work for art's sake? No. They did it to free themselves as best they might from their burden, to deliver themselves of a great incubus of living matter." Lowes Dickinson [unexpectedly perhaps] adds his testimony to that: "Without Art Religion is dumb; and without Religion, Art, if it is not insignificant, lacks the highest significance of which it is capable." And also Van Gogh: "To try to understand the real significance of what the great artists tell us in their masterpieces—*that* leads to God." And a greater artist, Michelangelo, maintained that nothing is nobler or more devout than good painting, since its function is to make an image of God's perfection.

In other words, artistic inspiration is verily a gift of God. This is implied in the statement of the Old Testament writer regarding Bezaleel whom the Holy Spirit commissioned in his craftsmanship for the sanctuary in the wilderness. It is significant that it is one of the few places in the Hebrew Scriptures where the Holy Spirit is mentioned. It is true that artists themselves may not be aware of the source of their inspiration, any more than Cyrus was aware that he was God's shepherd called by God to fulfil his purpose. Canon Lloyd

has said, "If the breath of God is in their works it does not follow that they recognize the source from which their consciousness of inspiration comes. Shakspere's hold upon Christian doctrine was sketchy, Keats seems to have been a pantheist. Hardy definitely repudiated the Christian way of life. A. E. Housman was practically an atheist. But if inspiration in art exists at all, these emphatically experienced it" (*The Inspiration of God*), i.e. art may be truly religious independently of its subject. It does not need to be designed for use in the Church's worship in order to be inherently sacred. Which has more of the divine in it—a picture by Corot or almost any picture to be bought in a church-furnishing depot?

And, incontrovertibly, we experience something of the inspiration and sanctifying power of Beauty when we subject ourselves to the impression which great art or natural loveliness makes upon us. Holiness signifies wholeness. And great Beauty has a unifying effect upon the personality. During the time that we are under its sway, the ordinary limitations of our nature are expanded, and we become free of another world. Have we sufficiently examined and pondered the meaning of the psychological reactions which any of the Ultimate Values induce in us? In the normal day-to-day activities of life we suffer from tension, the sway of contending appetites, the restlessness of unsatisfied hearts, and all the thwarting of human finitude; but when under the dominance of Beauty we become unified and feel released. Pressure relaxes. "A bolt is shot back somewhere in the breast." Then a conviction of "rightness" possesses us. I cannot describe that feeling; but you have known it. It brings with it an assurance of harmony—not only with yourself but with the universe: the sense that things are (as we say) "all right". The dreadful tyranny of solitude is ended for the time being. We are emancipated from the stringency of the temporal and transitory. The sense of sequence is abolished (as in the moment to which Faust cried "Stay!") and we have a fleeting notion of Eternity: a "Now-forever" baffling speech and explanation. At least momentarily we experience "salvation". Self is transcended and swallowed up in a larger whole.

Perhaps somewhere in the area of these remarks we find a deeper meaning than the author intended in *The History of Mr Polly*: "Man comes into this life to seek and to find his sufficient Beauty."

III

In the light of this, perhaps we may return to the question previously posed to which no answer is fully adequate, and gather what truth we can from some eminent declarations on the nature of Beauty. Plotinus, animated by the spirit of his master, Plato, asserts that "Beauty is a property in things which the soul recognizes as akin to its own essence, while the ugly is that which it feels to be alien and antipathetic. Beautiful things remind the soul of its own spiritual nature, . . . while the absolutely ugly is entirely devoid of divine meaning." Hegel paraphrased this when he said, "Beauty is merely the spiritual making itself known sensuously." And later,

Eucken, who seemed to promise a revival of spiritual thought in Germany before the Kaiser's war, and whose work is now unduly forgotten, declared that "in the good, the beautiful, the true we see Reality revealing its personal character. They are parts of a coherent and substantial spiritual world." And, as Evelyn Underhill commented on this passage: "Here, some of the veils of that substantial world are stripped off: Reality peeps through, and is recognized dimly, or acutely, by the imprisoned self." To Robert Bridges Beauty is the very being of God, the "Eternal Spouse" of his wisdom, the "angel of his presence thro all creation".

> The highest of all these occult influences,
> the quality of appearances that thro the sense
> wakeneth spiritual emotion in the mind of man.

God is ever seeking to make us lovely with his own loveliness:

> Delicate and subtle are the dealings of nature,
> whereby the emotionable sense secretly is touched
> to awareness and by glimpse of heavenly vision drawn
> within the attraction of the creative energy
> that is the ultimate life of all being so'er.

In the mysterious age-long evolutionary process, under the compelling influence of Beauty gradually making itself increasingly felt, the crude aggressive instincts of the "ego"—Self, Sex, and blind Impulse —have been raised

> from blind animal passion to the vision of Spirit.
> Visibles
> are changed to invisible; a fine-measured motion
> to immeasurable emotion.
>
> I see the emotion of saints, lovers, and poets all
> to be the kindling of some Personality
> by an eternizing passion; and that God's worshipper
> looking on any beauty falleth straightway in love;
> and that love is a fire in whose devouring flames
> all earthly ills are consumed, and at least flash of it,
> be it only a faint radiancy, the freed soul glimpseth,
> nay ev'n may think to have felt, some initiate foretaste
> of that mystic rapture, the consummation of which
> is the absorption of Selfhood in the Being of God.

An unintentional commentary on this passage was provided (before his poem appeared) by Evelyn Underhill: "The heart outstrips the clumsy senses, and sees (perhaps for an instant, perhaps for long periods of bliss) an undistorted and more veritable world. All things are perceived in the light of charity, and hence under the aspect of beauty; for Beauty is simply Reality seen with the eyes of love" (*Mysticism*, 310).

Among these exponents of Beauty I have quoted philosophers, ancient and modern, and a poet; and now from a different department of literature let me mention a historian, George Trevelyan, whose words come unbiased by any theological presuppositions:

"This flag of beauty, hung out by the mysterious Universe, to claim the worship of the heart of man, what is it, and what does its signal mean to us? . . . Like the Universe, like life, natural beauty

is also a mystery. But whatever it may be . . . whatever its interpretation may be, natural beauty is the ultimate spiritual appeal of the Universe, or nature, or of the great God of nature, to their nursling man. It, and it alone, makes a common appeal to the sectaries of all our religious and scientific creeds, to the lovers of all our different schools of poetry and art, ancient and modern, and to many more besides these. It is the highest common denominator in the spiritual life of to-day" (*An Autobiography*, p. 106).

IV

Obviously, then, we must take account of this, of our own experience of Beauty as well as of what the experts have said about it, and try to see the implications of this magnificent and arresting reality—what the interpretation of it can be and what it means for us, here and now. And as a preliminary to that, let us ask: What space does this truth occupy in Biblical religion?

The mention of Beauty is not so rare in the Scriptures as some Puritans, on the one hand, and some critics, on the other, suppose. But it is not so prominent as some would like, because of the heathen environment amid which it was set. The sensual beauty of the pagan world made suspect the sensuous beauty of the spiritual world.

Unless you look it up in a concordance you would be incredulous about the number of times that the word "beauty" occurs in the Old Testament. The Hebrews did entertain the idea, and connected it with God. When the Old Testament speaks, more than once of the "beauty of holiness", it obviously suggests the "holiness of Beauty". Nowhere does it take a utilitarian view of Nature, as something placed at man's disposal as a means of making a livelihood. Notice how the Bible opens with a poem (in itself of sublime beauty) on the subject of Creation, treated in the spirit of great art, not of scientific exactitude; and there, for example, it states that the trees were intended not only to bear fruit and sustain life but also to adorn the earth—"every tree that is pleasant to the sight".

And when we turn to the New Testament, what can be more beautiful than the art of the apparently artless Gospels? Do you remember what was the turning-point in the influences that led to Simone Weil's conversion? according to her own statement in her "Letter to a Priest"? "The Cross is enough for me: the proof for me. The thing that is miraculous is the perfect beauty of the accounts of the Passion." Tennyson speaks of Christ's "loveliness of perfect deeds, more strong than all poetic thought". And Mr Clutton Brock pointed out how Christ, "without rhetoric or strain, with ordinary words and with a music that steals unnoticed into them, can raise everything into poetry. It is his natural speech, and he seems not to know it himself". When he told his disciples to consider the lilies of the field and stated that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these, he was asserting the absolute value of Beauty and the relative value of the luxury that apes its appearance. It is not a theologian

but an artist, Van Gogh, who penetrated to this aspect of the truth of our Lord's activity: "Christ lived serenely as an artist, greater than all artists, disdaining marble and clay and colour, working in living flesh."

V

The relevance of all this to our own spiritual life is unmistakable. God is the "First, the only Fair"; and worship should not only be a duty but a delight; and it is because we have neither realized nor given evidence of it that the Church shows so little of the wonder that lies at the heart of all true religion. The word "numinous" was a fashionable one a little time ago, and all genuine beauty partakes of the numinous. Its absence from our churches is not only an impoverishment but a kind of blasphemy. What sort of God would you suppose the Christian God to be if you were an uninstructed outsider and dropped into one of our services to see what was going on? What would you make of the hymn book (its tattered condition when offered to you by a sidesman, and the mawkish doggerel of some of its contents), the tasteless taste of the windows and the vulgarity of the memorials and the ornaments, the luscious sentimentality of the music, and the general air of listlessness in the majority of the worshippers? Am I drawing too cynical a picture of what you might possibly (if not probably) find? "A gloriously rich Reality" was von Hügel's description of God, much more glorious and delectable than we have ever grasped.

> O wondrous peace, in thought to dwell
> On excellence divine,
> To know that none on earth can tell
> How fair his beauties shine.

How urgently do we need to have presented to our minds the ideas which move us to the highest of our activities, that of adoration; and it is God in his inconceivable Beauty whom we need more worthily to discover and to display. Oh yes, consider it again lest we remain blind to it. Consider, for example, what Professor Alexander said in his book entitled *Beauty and Other Forms of Value*, in which he sums up his views in a definition: "The Beautiful is the object and the satisfaction of the creative impulse, when that impulse is contemplative instead of practical." In the Beauty created by the artist we discern the presence of the artist's mind in its creation. It may be said to be the object and satisfaction of his creative impulse when that impulse was contemplative rather than practical. It is a legitimate adaptation of this idea to say that natural beauty is the expression and satisfaction of God's creative impulse when it is contemplative. For example, the flowers are beautiful because God has made each one separately for his own delight, in which we are allowed to share when they come in our way. "Beauty", says Alexander, "implies the presence of the artist's mind in its creation." That may be taken as a comment on the psalmist's assertion: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork." Ruskin

pointed out that the clouds assume their ever-varying shapes and shades for no prosaic purpose, but just in order to make a vault above our heads that is exquisite to behold. Croce adds the weight of his testimony to Alexander's contention: "A work of art throws the spectator back into the frame of mind in which the artist produced it." That may be interpreted to mean that in our joy in natural beauty we are thinking God's thoughts along with him. The aesthetic faculty, as we saw, is a kind of "surplus" in man—an evidence of his more than mortal dignity: the creation of Beauty would be a kind of "superfluity" in God were it not that it is an essential part of his personality, an element of his "Glory".

Again, Croce says, "Art is intuition." What does he mean by that? The theist interprets it to mean that art owes its beauty to the artist's insight into the Beauty of God. Hence Beauty has been to many people a veritable disclosure of the Reality which "eye hath not seen nor ear heard", and which hath prepared for man things which his heart hath not yet conceived. For instance, Lucie Christine's "craving for an absolute and unchanging loveliness on which to expend her large-hearted powers of adoration and self-giving led her, like the Platonists, through visible beauty to its invisible source".

But an objector may quite reasonably ask, What about the ugliness that sometimes seems to mar the Creator's work? He may remind us that Emerson said that there is a crack in everything which God has made. Does that not detract from the truth of his perfect and unflawed Loveliness? But a crack in a priceless work of art does not hide the fact of its original beauty; sometimes, on the contrary, it emphasizes it. There is a crack, truly, in almost every aspect of this world's life: the dark and sinister fact of evil. The theist tries to give at least a partial explanation of it in the doctrine of the Fall, not only a human but also a subhuman Fall, possibly a pre-mundane Fall. This removes from us any need to imagine that there is a flaw in God's own Glory. Perhaps the contrast (of which we are so bitterly aware) between the crack and the Beauty makes still more conspicuous the value of that which has been damaged. "And God saw everything that he had made; and, behold, it was very good." The ugliness is not of his making. "From the Divine Beauty", said Aquinas, "everything had its origin." His is the Glory; he is the Blessed God; Bliss is the fabric of the universe; and of the Beatific Vision we already have a glimpse in the loveliness which our senses perceive. In an immortal passage in the *Phaedrus* Plato declares that this temporal Beauty is the means by which the soul is caught up and transcends itself and touches the Absolute. And in the *Symposium*, in a passage which is all the more impressive in its splendour because it occurs in a discussion of a very profane kind of love, he directs the aspirant towards the supreme Loveliness: "The true order of going is to use the beauties of earth as steps along which one mounts upwards for the sake of that other Beauty." And it is of that other Beauty (of which, perhaps, he had first heard from his earliest master, Plato) St Augustine cries, in a passion of regret, "O Beauty, old yet ever new, too late have I loved Thee."

It is this Beauty in its endless enticement that never lets us be content with any lesser beauty. If God is (as we know him to be) "Mysterium Tremendum", he is likewise (as we also know him to be) "Mysterium Fascinans"; not only One whom we dare not approach in his awful Holiness, but One to whom we are irresistibly drawn by the lure of his loveliness; not only, as a French writer has called him, "the eternal Torment of man", but the Sum of all his hopes and aspirations, who through the disguises of earthly beauty wakes in us a longing that can only be appeased in himself.

When Beauty grows too great to bear,
How shall I ease me of its ache?
For Beauty more than bitterness
Makes the heart break.

Now while I watch the dreaming sea
With isles like flowers about her breast
Only one voice in all the world
Can give me rest.

LUMSDEN BARKWAY, BISHOP.

Pseudonymity in the New Testament

ALTHOUGH there is no complete agreement on this subject among scholars, yet to many of them it seems certain that some of the New Testament authors wrote under pseudonyms. Those of the clergy who are convinced by the evidence and arguments put forward by the scholars, and who think that, for example, St Paul did not write the Pastoral Epistles, or St Peter *2 Peter*, are faced with various practical and intellectual problems. Should they quote from those writings which they think to be pseudonymous as though they were in fact authentic? Should they say "As St Paul says . . ." when quoting from the Pastoral Epistles, and "As St Peter says . . ." when quoting from *2 Peter*? Or should they use some such cumbersome phrase as "As the author of the Pastoral Epistles says . . ."? Should they hide their own opinions on these matters from the congregation, or should they reveal them? And how are they themselves to understand the act of writing under a pseudonym? Is a pseudonymous writer rightly called a "forger"?

I do not know anywhere where these problems have been aired recently; the following notes have therefore been put together in the hope of helping somebody, or at least of bringing the matter up for discussion.

A. *Which New Testament books are thought to be pseudonymous?*

Although, as I said, there is no complete agreement, it seems to me that a case can be made out for the pseudonymity of the following twelve New Testament books.

1. *The Gospel according to St Matthew.* This Gospel would be

pseudonymous only if it were originally published with the title *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*. There is no claim to apostolic authorship in the book itself. Dr G. D. Kilpatrick suggests that it was originally so published.[1]

2. *Luke-Acts*. The author claims to be a companion of Paul; if he were not, then he may have been using this claim as a pseudonym. This was the conclusion of, for example, H. Windisch:[2] "Acts cannot have been written by Luke, the contemporary of the apostles and the companion of Paul, because above all the author has no longer a correct idea of the events before and during Paul's missionary activity, of what Paul accomplished, or of the fundamental ideas of Pauline theology."

3. *The Gospel according to St John*. The author appears to claim to be an eye-witness, "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (John 19. 35, 21. 34; cf. 1. 14); that is, presumably, John the son of Zebedee, who is otherwise not mentioned in the Fourth Gospel. "The possibility has to be taken seriously into account that a man, not himself one of the original disciples of Jesus, may have been so completely absorbed by their testimony as to have been driven not only to bear witness to the world, but also to the Church, and to have done this with true, though derived, apostolic authority."[3]

4. *The Epistle to the Ephesians*.

5. *The Pastoral Epistles*.

6. *The Epistle of James*. The author claims no more than that he is "James the servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ", Jas. 1. 1. This has usually been taken to mean James the brother of the Lord (Mark 6. 3, etc.), and may have been so intended by the writer.

7. *The First Epistle of Peter*.

8. *The Second Epistle of Peter*.

9. *The Epistle of Jude*. Like James, Jude claims no more than to be "the servant of Jesus Christ, and the brother of James"; again the reference may be to Jude the brother of the Lord (Mark 6. 3).

Hebrews and the Johannine Epistles are not included in this list: *Hebrews* does not claim to be by Paul or by anyone else; neither do the Johannine Epistles name their author, though 1 John 1, 1 might be taken as a claim to apostolic authorship. *Colossians* and 2 *Thessalonians* have often been considered pseudonymous: though, in my opinion, with less evidence than that which there is for the twelve in the list.

The force of the argument for pseudonymity in these nine cases varies greatly from one to another. Probably 2 *Peter* is most frequently accepted as pseudonymous, with the Pastoral Epistles next. The following table gives the conclusions of some writers on the New Testament, selected without any view to "proportional representation".

[1] G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel according to St Matthew* (1946), pp. 138 f.

[2] F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part I. The Acts of the Apostles, Vol. II (1922), p. 348.

[3] E. C. Hoskyns and F. N. Davey, *The Fourth Gospel* (1940), p. 101.

	Moffatt.	Peake.	Gore.	Dibelius.	Lowther Clarke.	Catholic Commentary.	I.V.F.
Matthew	—	—	—	—	—	A	A
Luke-Acts	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
John	P	P	A[1]	P	P	A	A
Ephesians	P	?	A	P	A	A	A
Pastoral Epistles	P	?	A?	P	P	A	A
James	?	A	?	P	?	A	A
1 Peter	A	A	A	P	P?	A	A
2 Peter	P	P	P	P	P	A	A
Jude	A	A	A	P	P?	A	A

A = Authentic; P = Pseudonymous; ? = uncertainty.

The possibility that *Matthew* was published pseudonymously was not considered in the first five cases.

Moffatt = J. Moffatt, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (1911).
Peake = The Contributors to A. S. Peake (Ed.), *A Commentary on the Bible* (1919).
Gore = The Contributors to C. Gore, H. L. Goudge, A. Guillaume (Edd.), *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture* (1928).
Dibelius = M. Dibelius, *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature* (English Translation, 1936).
Lowther Clarke = W. K. Lowther Clarke, *Concise Bible Commentary* (1952).
Catholic Commentary = The Contributors to B. Orchard (Ed.), *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (1953).
I.V.F. = The Contributors to F. Davidson (Ed.), *The New Bible Commentary* (1953).

It may be, then, that none of the New Testament books are pseudonymous; or it may be that only a few are pseudonymous, and not all the twelve listed above. If the former is right, then there is no problem; but if any one book is pseudonymous, then there is a problem. On the latter assumption, let us consider the factors which may have led Christian writers of the period *c.* 75–150 A.D. to attribute their work to others.

B. *Factors leading to the use of pseudonyms.*

Writing about pseudonymity in the Old Testament, the Rev.

[1] The Contributor to *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture* on *The Gospel According to St John*, W. Lock, is uncertain whether the beloved disciple was the author of the Fourth Gospel; but an additional note on the authorship of the Fourth Gospel by C. Harris states the case for authenticity unequivocally.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC

L. H. Brockington said recently: "We ought probably to see the resort to pseudonymity as a result of several different lines of tradition and development."[1] Similarly in the New Testament, in different cases different factors seem to have been more powerful.

First, a writer or a school of writers may have come under the influence of a great teacher, or may have studied his works. Such a disciple, when he in his turn came to write, may have attributed his work to his teacher. His intention would have been to say, "These are not my ideas, but his." If *Ephesians* is not authentic, then the author may have attributed it to Paul because he had built his composition on *Colossians* and on other genuine Pauline Epistles. Similarly, it has been suggested that the preaching and teaching of John the son of Zebedee lies behind the Fourth Gospel.

Second, at a time when the Church was threatened by teachers of new and heretical doctrines, a writer who wished to recall the faithful to the apostolic teaching may have found it necessary to publish his work under the name of an apostle, or under the name of another member of the earlier generation of Christians. This factor may have been uppermost in the case of the Pastoral Epistles, *2 Peter*, and *Jude*.

Third, pseudonymous writing was an accepted literary form in the ancient world. Speeches and letters in historical books were freely composed by the author.[2] Whole books had been put under the name of an ancient figure by the Jews: Enoch, the XII Patriarchs, Moses, David, Solomon, etc. *The Apocryphal New Testament* and other early Christian literature prove that this practice was continued by the Christians, heretical and orthodox alike. This factor—the fact that it was a way of writing—may have operated in the case of *1 Peter* if it is not authentic, and in the cases of *Matthew*, *Luke-Acts*, *James*, and *2 Peter*.

The case of *2 Peter* is particularly interesting. It is generally agreed that the author of *2 Peter* has made liberal use of *Jude*, incorporating the greater part of it, with alterations, in his work. The author of *Jude* had said: "Remember the words which were spoken before by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ . . ." (Jude 17). The author of *2 Peter* seems to be supplying the apostolic source for the reference in *Jude*, and so making it appear that *Jude* is quoting from St Peter.

The case of *James* may be somewhat similar. If Dr Farrer[3] is right, the author chose the name "James" (*Ἰάκωβος*), because he intended to address all Christians as the twelve tribes of the new Israel; and he then based his paragraphs of exhortation on the names, characters, and histories of the patriarchs of the old Israel.

The use of a pseudonym may therefore have been a means of acknowledging dependence on a teacher or writer of the past; or a

[1] "The Problem of Pseudonymity," *J.T.S.*, New Series, Vol. IV, p. 19.

[2] Cf. e.g. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part I, The Acts of the Apostles, Vol. II, pp. 13 f.; Vol. V, pp. 402 ff.

[3] A Farrer, *A Study in St Mark* (1951), p. 320; but cp. *St Matthew and St Mark* (1954), p. 230.

means of recalling the contemporary church to the apostolic faith; or a literary form, in which the writer could express those ideas which he was inspired to teach; or a combination of these.

C. *Conclusions.*

1. If we grant, as we must, that at the time when the New Testament was written, pseudonymity was an accepted literary form, it follows that we should not speak of those who wrote in this way as "forgers".[1] A forger is one who writes in the name of another for his own profit: they did not do so. Forgery involves deceit for gain; pseudonymity did not.

2. It is worth noticing that although the contributors to *A Catholic Commentary* do not consider any of the New Testament books pseudonymous, this is not because their principles forbid them to do so. They admit the presence of pseudonymous writing in the Old Testament, e.g. *The Canticle of Moses,* Deut. 32. 1–43,[2] and *The Wisdom of Solomon.*[3] Fr C. Lattey, S.J., says in connexion with the latter: "The need of a careful investigation of literary form in biblical studies has been recently stressed by His Holiness Pope Pius XII in his encyclical, *Divino afflante Spiritu* (30th Sept., 1943)."[4]

The passage in the encyclical is so important that I quote it *in extenso*:

> "But frequently the literal sense is not so obvious in the words and writings of ancient oriental authors as it is with the writers of to-day. For what they intended to signify by their words is not determined only by the laws of grammar or philology, nor merely by the context: it is absolutely necessary for the interpreter to go back in spirit to those remote centuries of the East and make proper use of the aids afforded by history, archaeology, ethnology, and other sciences, in order to discover what literary forms the writers of that early age intended to use, and did in fact employ. For to express what they had in mind the ancients of the East did not always use the same forms and expressions as we use to-day: they used those which were current among the people of their own time and place; and what these were the exegete cannot determine *a priori*, but only form a careful study of ancient oriental literature. . . .
>
> "The Sacred Books need not exclude any of the forms of expression which were commonly used in human speech by the ancient peoples, especially in the East, to convey their meaning, so long as they are in no way incompatible with God's sanctity and truth. . . .
>
> "Consequently, if the Catholic exegete is to meet fully the requirements of modern biblical study he must, in expounding Sacred Scripture and vindicating its immunity from all error, make prudent use of this further aid: he must, that is, ask himself how far the form of expression or literary idiom employed by the sacred writer may contribute to the true and genuine interpretation: and he may be sure that this part of his task cannot be neglected without great detriment to Catholic exegesis. For—to mention only this example—in many cases in which the sacred authors are accused of some historical inaccuracy or of the inexact recording of some events, it is found to be a question of nothing more than those customary and characteristic forms of expression or styles of narrative which were current in human intercourse among the ancients, and which were in fact quite legiti-

[1] E.g. Fr H. Wilmering, S.J., on *2 Peter*: ". . . Would a forger have been so careless about imitating the manner of address, style, and vocabulary of 1 Pet.?" *A Catholic Commentary,* Sec. 952d.

[2] Ibid., Sec. 222a. [3] Ibid., Sec. 361 and Sec. 388b, f. [4] Ibid., Sec. 388 f.

> mately and commonly employed. A just impartiality therefore demands that when these are found in the word of God, which is expressed in human language for men's sake, they should be no more stigmatized as error than when similar expressions are employed in daily usage. Thus a knowledge and careful appreciation of ancient modes of expression and literary forms and styles will provide a solution to many of the objections made against the truth and historical accuracy of Holy Writ; and the same study will contribute with equal profit to a fuller and clearer perception of the mind of the Sacred Author.''[1]

It would seem therefore that in principle the contributors to *A Catholic Commentary* could admit pseudonymity in the New Testament as well as in the Old. (To them, of course, *The Wisdom of Solomon* is part of the Old Testament Canon.) Their reason for not doing so is entirely that the evidence in each case is, in their opinion, insufficient to disprove authenticity.

3. It may be relevant to contrast, with the Papal encyclical, some sentences from the note on the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles by the Rev. A. M. Stibbs in *The New Bible Commentary* (I.V.F.):

> ". . . Documents which claim to be something which they are not can no longer carry full weight as canonical Scripture, as the divinely inspired record of apostolic teaching; and, therefore, any who entertain such doubts about these Epistles had better leave detailed comment on their abiding Christian significance alone. It would be better for them virtually to leave such documents out of their operative Canon of Scripture until they come to a better mind and a surer faith. For our part, we accept them as Pauline, and desire with God's help to seek to understand them accordingly.[2]

4. Pseudonymous writers believed that they spoke for their principal; they believed that what they were writing, he would have said. I suggest that we should accept their faith in this matter; and that therefore when, for example, an anglican priest celebrates Holy Communion, he should not say at the Comfortable Words: "Hear also what the author of the Pastoral Epistles saith . . ."

5. On the other hand, we must accept the findings of biblical criticism in so far as they seem to us valid. Therefore if for example a preacher is convinced that St Peter did not write *2 Peter*, he may not use that epistle in his preaching in such a way that his argument depends for its cogency upon Petrine authorship.

6. There is of course no universal rule concerning the advisability of disclosing one's opinions and convictions on the authorship of the New Testament books to the congregation—other than charity. Many congregations would not be interested; many might be seriously and wrongly offended. Nevertheless it may be that some boys and girls at grammar schools and in study groups at universities are finding out about the conclusions and theories of scholars on these questions; such people will expect the preacher to be honest, and will welcome it if he is.

J. C. Fenton.

[1] *Biblical Studies, Encyclical Letter (Divino Afflante Spiritu) of His Holiness Pius XII by Divine Providence Pope.* Translated by G. D. Smith, Sec. 39–42.
[2] Op. cit., p. 1063a.

South African Letter

For many years the revision of the Book of Common Prayer has been proceeding in the Church of the Province of South Africa. Until recently, the fruits of the revision, tentatively authorized for us by the Bishops, were to be found in three small books. In 1950, the Provincial Synod gave its assent to the completed work, and during 1954 *A Book of Common Prayer, set forth by authority for use in the Church of the Province of South Africa* was issued.

Parts of the contents smell of the 1920s. Those were the days when humanism rather than the Biblical Revelation determined the doctrine of God. It was not becoming in God to be angry, and it was not becoming in man to stand in dread of God. Therefore, "be not angry with us for ever" has been excised from the Litany, and "fear" replaces "dread", and we are no longer miserable sinners. At one point a change has been made in the order of the petitions, with a hideous disregard for Cranmer's rhythms.

The 1920s were the days of pacifism, which accounts for the substitution of, "For it is thou, Lord, only that makest us dwell in safety" for, "Because there is none other that fighteth for us, but only thou, O God". Those were the days when the theory of Progressive Revelation, having relegated the Old Testament to an early stage in the progress of man's doctrines about God, found difficulty in justifying the use of the Old Testament in public worship. Therefore such Sunday epistles as those appointed for Trinity xii and xiii, which are Christian interpretations of the Old Testament, have vanished.

In the Burial Office, Psalm 39 has gone, and Psalm 23 takes its place. This piece of sentimentalism is buttressed by permission to use 2 Cor. 4. 16 ff. or Rev. 20. 1 ff. in place of 1 Cor. 15.

Those were the days when the Bishops supposed that at their Consecration gifts of liturgical skill had been bestowed upon them, and they alone undertook the revision. The proceedings of the Liturgical Committee have never been divulged, but parts of their work strongly suggest a picture of the several bishops pleading for this or that on the ground that "it would be rather nice". Only by some such method can the new Order for Confirmation have come into being. Its theology is incoherent. An Introduction, which has to be read aloud, states that Confirmation is a continuation of the laying on of hands by Peter and John at Samaria. One can but presume that the intention is to teach that "as yet the Holy Spirit had fallen on none of them", that is, the candidates standing before the Bishop. The Ministration of Public Baptism of Infants, however, still contains the words, "call upon God . . . that this child may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost" and, "Wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost", and "It hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit". Later in the Order for Confirmation itself, just before the laying on of hands, the Bishop prays, "Almighty and everliving God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these thy servants by water and the Holy Ghost". That does not deter him from saying,

immediately after the laying on of hands, "You have now received of God the gift of his Holy Spirit".

This fine muddle, it would seem, escaped the notice both of the Bishops and of successive Provincial Synods. However, theological incoherence is a fault which the Church of the Province is unlikely to observe—and it is one of the hazards of the freedom of a Church to elect its own Bishops that it is liable to get the Bishops it deserves.

The Revised Order of Holy Communion likewise smells of the 1920s, though it is a different smell. Those were the days when much attention was given to the Epiclesis. In consequence, the new Order has two.

Those parts of the revision that have been made most recently can the most readily stand scrutiny. This is not entirely due to the fact that latterly the Liturgical Committee included others than Bishops. Apart from the smell of the 1920s in certain parts of the new Book, it is a welcome enrichment of the Common Prayer of the Church. Provision is made of Collects, Epistles, and Gospels for the Lesser Feasts and Fasts, or Offices for the Admission of Catechumens and the Burial of a Baptized Infant. Finally, as the production of the Book was undertaken by the Oxford University Press, the type, the printing, and the binding are alike admirable.

One or two of the congregations of the body that calls itself "The Church of England in South Africa", a dissenting body which refuses to acknowledge the authority of the Bishops of the Province, have recently made overtures of peace. This is a welcome event. The Church of the Province greatly needs an Evangelical emphasis. Tension between "Evangelicals" and "Anglo-Catholics" is not automatically beneficial; but so long as the "Evangelicals" are in schism mutual dislike and the danger of increasing bigotry on both sides make profitable tension impossible. Not all the dioceses, nor all the clergy in any diocese, are "Anglo-Catholic", but there is a tendency that way. This is alarming because the Church of the Province is such a sadly untheological Church; and an untheological "Catholicism" is an ugly thing. There are many priests who are liable to equate "Catholic" with "Roman" or, more disastrously, apt to distinguish between "Catholic" and "Biblical".

The Church has a prophetic role to play, but a Church which essays such a role without any theology, without, in particular, a Biblical theology, might give the message of a Zedekiah, son of Chenaanah, rather than the message of a Micaiah, son of Imlah. The vast distances to be covered and the amount of work to be done by the average parish priest call for an expenditure of physical and spiritual energy that leaves little over for study. There is courage in plenty and devotion in plenty. What is often lacking is the desire to study, and a sacerdotal authoritarianism is found to salve the conscience.

The Church of the Province of South Africa is faced with an uncertain future, especially in the sphere of Race Relations. It is caught between precept and practice, as the Dutch Reformed Church is not.

The latter is quite clear about congregations of mixed races: they are not allowed. The former is equally clear that they are allowed. But in practice there is in most parts of the country one church building for the whites and another for the non-whites, and where there is but the one building there is constant friction. In most parts of the country there are white Anglicans as bitterly opposed to mixed congregations as are members of the Dutch Reformed Church. There are, of course, exceptions. But it must in honesty be said that those who publicly oppose *apartheid* are not expressing the views of the majority of white Anglicans.

There is much truth in what Canon Collins has to say. Yet he does more harm than good in saying it where he does. Prophetic denunciations in the Old Testament were made by men who were involved in the situation, men who risked their lives to speak the Word of the Lord. Such men speak with authority and win respect. Nothing is gained by denunciations of South Africa addressed from the safety of a London pulpit to a congregation that is not involved. Nothing is gained, and harm is done. It has long been a taunt of the Afrikaner that the Anglican Church in this country is not indigenous; that it remains the Church of England; that its Bishops, having made a bold stand on behalf of the African, then retire to England, leaving the South African to live in the mess they have made. The Canon Collinses give that taunt a stronger lease of life.

More bones of more Bishops in South Africa would help. What is wanted still more is more South African born and South African trained priests and bishops. (There has not yet been a Bishop both born and educated in South Africa.) The witness of a South African priest is no more acceptable to the Nationalist for being given in a South African accent. But it is accorded respect.

The number of South African candidates has increased since the war. But the figures are not yet impressive. St Paul's College, Grahamstown, is the sole Theological College for whites. One third of the total number of ordinands whom it has sent out in the fifty-two years of its existence have been sent out in the last nine years. That is certainly encouraging. But the College accommodates only twenty-two students. In order to replace the wastage by death and retirement, something like twenty-two new deacons a year are required.

Until 1939, the Church of the Province depended upon England for most of its clergy. St Paul's College was an auxiliary Theological College. It is now recognized that the Church of the Province must supply its own clergy. But there will be a time-lag between the recognition and the actual supply. A complacent expectation that England will supply the needs, an expectation a hundred years old, will not easily perish. Circumstances will compel a greater use of laymen. They may compel experimentation in a "part-time" priesthood. But I see no signs that the Bishops are looking forward in this matter. They seem to be hoping for a return to the good old days.

There are some who think that in a couple of generations—if civilized South Africa lasts so long—the Anglican Church will be

almost wholly non-white, the whites having attached themselves to the Dutch Reformed Church. The reasons for so thinking are these. First, that in many of the country districts the Anglican congregations are visibly shrinking. Whereas the senior branches of the Civil Service, for example, were staffed by English-speaking men twenty years ago, the Afrikaans-speaking officials are now in the majority. The police and the railway are now ninety per cent. Afrikaners. It is not always true that Afrikaners are members of the Dutch Reformed Church. But their children, since their home language is Afrikaans, are ill at ease in English-speaking Sunday schools and tend to drift to the Dutch Reformed Church. Could the Anglican Church become fully bilingual, the drift might be stayed. It is, however, a natural though unfortunate fact that many English-speaking folk regard the Anglican services as a cultural link with their English heritage and would fiercely oppose the introduction of bilingual services.

While the English-speaking population dwindles, the number of priests to minister to them also diminishes. The God-fearing Anglicans will join a denomination that can minister to them; their sons and their daughters will marry Afrikaners. For a time there will be small pockets of last ditch Englishers, preferring a familiar service once in six months to regular worship in a foreign idiom or a foreign tongue. Gradually they will be submerged. Meanwhile, many Anglicans will leave the Anglican Church in disapproval of its "liberal" attitude to the non-whites, refusing to worship along with the non-whites, refusing even to worship in the building which the non-whites use at different hours.

In a couple of generations, therefore, the argument runs, the Anglican Church will be concerned almost wholly with the natives and the coloureds. Whether the prophecy is true, no one can say. No one can say, however, that it is wholly unrealistic. F. C. Synge.

An Eighteenth-Century Undergraduate and the XXXIX Articles

The university system in the eighteenth century has been much criticized and in 1782 Vicesimus Knox referred to the examinations as having "reached the utmost poignancy of ridicule". But, as the late Mr John Beresford observes,[1] if the somewhat easy-going supervision to which the undergraduate was subject "could be notoriously abused by the lazy, stupid, or unscrupulous student it at least had the merit that it left the student who had brains really worth cultivating to cultivate it for himself". Perhaps Mr John Ffolliott of Trinity College, Oxford, was such a student. He does at least appear to have been of the opinion that the subscription to the XXXIX Articles that was required of him at his matriculation was more than a mere formality.

I have in my possession an interleaved copy of the XXXIX Articles arranged and annotated by Edward Welchman and printed by the

[1] *Diary of a Country Parson*, James Woodforde, Vol. I, p. 158.

Clarendon Press in 1714.[1] It is in its original binding and on the front end paper is written the name J. Ffolliott, in a mid-eighteenth-century hand, and the copious notes on all the interleaved pages—to which in a few places a number of extra sheets have been added—are clearly by the same person.[2] The book was subsequently in the possession of Mr S. Jackson of Balliol College in 1812,[3] but he has left no evidence of his studies beyond further references in the Notes to the New Testament which seemed to him appropriate.

In the Preface Welchman[4] states that though the book is intended for those entering the university who will subscribe to the Articles on matriculation, it is chiefly intended for the use of those who will go on to read for Holy Orders. He is careful to say that it does not pretend to be a new exposition of the Articles like that of Burnet, but is a textbook for the student, to whom it will prove more useful than the Exposition by William Beveridge which was imperfect at the time it was issued.[5]

The book is elaborately annotated with many references to the New Testament and to the Fathers, and at the beginning the following list of books, *in hoc opere laudati*.

Exposition of the Creed, by Bishop *Pearson*. Folio.
Origines Sacrae, by Bp *Stillingfleet*. Quarto.
—his Vindications of the doctrine of the Trinity. Oct.
—his Idolatry of the Church of *Rome*. Oct.
The Principles and Duties of Natural Religion, by Bishop *Wilkins*. Oct.

[1] 2nd Edition. The first edition appeared in 1712.

[2] There is no evidence that this John Ffolliot was of Trinity College, but the following entry in Foster's *Alumni* is the only one agreeable to the date of the book itself and to the hand writing. "*Ffolliott* John. s. of John of Dublin Ireland, gent. Trinity Coll. matric. 2. May 1751, aged 18. B.A. 1755. M.A. 1762."

[3] On the front fly-leaf "S. Jackson. Balliol College, April 21st, 1812." *Jackson* Samuel. s. of John of Great Easton, Essex, arm. Balliol Coll. matric. 26. July 1810, aet. 17. B.A. 1814. M.A. 1817 (Foster, *Alumni*).

[4] *Edward Welchman*. Magdalen Hall. matric. 7. July 1679. aet. 14. B.A. 1683. Fellow of Merton 1684. M.A. 1688. Chorister Magdalen Coll. 1679–82. Rector of Lapworth, Co. Warwick, on presentation of Merton Coll., 1690–1739. Archdeacon of Cardigan 1727, chaplain to the Bishop of Lichfield and Canon 1732, rector of Solihull, Co. Warwick, which he held until his death on 19 May 1739.

Welchman wrote *A Defence of the Church of England from the Charge of Schism and Heresy* (London, 1692) in answer to Henry Dodwell's vindication of the Non-Juring Bishops. He also published, in 1695, for the benefit of his parishioners at Lapworth, a devotional work *The Husbandman's Manual directing him how to improve the several Actions of his Calling, and the most usual Occurrences of his Life, to the Glory of God and the Benefit of his Soul.*

His son, John Welchman, born at Lapworth, was also at Merton, though he afterwards migrated to Hart Hall, was vicar of Tamworth, Co. Warwick, 1726–64, and seems to have been undistinguished except for a poem "On the first day of the Plentiful Harvest 1741" which was published in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for that year.

(Foster, *Alumni*. Wood, *Athenae*, ii, 1721, 2nd Ed., p. 948. Bloxam's *Magd. Coll. Register*, i, 117.)

[5] Burnet's Exposition appeared in 1699. Beveridge was engaged on a similar work at the same time, but with characteristic modesty kept back his own work in deference to his contemporary. It was published posthumously but incompletely in 1710. It is printed in full in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, 1846, Vol. VII. See also More and Cross, *Anglicanism*, p. 94.

Grotius de Veritate Religionis Christianae.
—de Satisfactione Christi. Duodecimo.
Dr Sherlock's Discourse of the Divine Providence. Quarto.
—Discourse of a Future Judgement. Oct.
The Whole Duty of Man.
The Art of Contentment, by the author of the Whole Duty of Man.
The Lively Oracles, by the same author.
Mr Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity. Fol.
Mr Ray's Wisdom of God in the Works of Creation. Edit. 4. Oct.
Dr Scott's Christian Life. 3. Voll. Oct.
Alex. *Nowell's* Cathechisms. Quarto. 1572.
Bp *Jewel's* Works. Fol.
Fasciculus Controversianus Theologicarum per J. *Prideaux,* Episc. Wigorn. Quarto.
Mr *Nelson's* Companion for the Festivals and Fasts. Edit. 4. 1707. Oct.
Bp *Cosin's* Scholastical Hist. of the Canon of Scripture. Quarto.
G. *Bulli.* Episc. Menev. Def. Fid. Nicaenae. Quarto vel Fol.
—Judicium Ecclesiae Catholicae de necessitate credendi quod Christus sit Deus. Oct. vel. Fol. cum *Grabii* Notis.
Arch-Bp *Tillotson's* Sermons. Fol.
Dr *Cave's* Historia Literaria. 2 Vols. Fol.
G. *Outram's* de Sacrificiis. Quarto vel. Oct.
Bp *Lloyd's* Historical Accounts of Church Government in Great Britain. Oct.
Dr *Stanhope's* Sermon on 2 Tim. 3. 16–17. Quarto.
Bp *Hall's* Works. Fol.
Dr *Claget's* Sermons. Oct.
Mr *Burscough's* Discourse of Schism. Oct.
Bp *Abbot's* Defence of Mr *Perkin's* Reformed Catholick against *Bishop.* Quarto. 1606.
Bp *Buckeridge's* Discourse concerning Kneeling at the Communion. Quarto. 1618.
Dr *Field* of the Church. Fol. 2nd Ed. 1628.
Mr *Wall's* History of Infant Baptism. Quarto. 2nd Ed.
—his Conference. Duod.
Bp *Sanderson's* Sermons. Fol.
Bp Patrick's Answer to the Touch-Stone of the Reformed Gospel. Oct.
Mason de Ministerio Anglicano. Fol.
—his Authority of the Church in making Canons &c. 4to.
Mr *Kettlewell's* Measures of Obedience. Quarto.
Dr *Goodman's* Penitent Pardoned. Oct.
Mr *Chillingworth's* Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation. Fol.
Dr *Potter's* Discourse of Church Government. Oct.
Bp *Bilson* of Christian Subjection. Oct.
Bp *Andrews's* Sermons. Fol.
Bp *Blackhall's* Sufficiency of Revelation in eight sermons, at Mr *Boyle's* Lecture. Oct.
—Sermon on James 2. 24.
Mr *Walker's* Modest Plea for Infant Baptism. Duod.
A Discourse of Communion in one kind. Quarto. 1687.
A Treatise of Celibacy of the Clergy Quarto. 1688.
Arch-Bp *Whitgift's* Defence of his answers to the Admonition. Fol.
A Vindication of the Ordinations of England. Quarto. 1688.
Bp *Bedel's* Life and Letters. Oct.
Book of *Homilies.*
Book of *Canons.* 1603.
Book of *Common Prayer.*

A formidable reading list, but though it is not expressly stated to be so Mr Ffolliott seems to have used it as such. Apart from copying in full on the interleaved pages the New Testament references in Greek (not a bad idea this and many a theological student of to-day per-

haps might improve his New Testament Greek by copying such references into an interleaved copy of Bicknell!) and supplementing them by quotations from the Old Testament in English, he does appear to have consulted most of the works listed above, to judge from the excerpts, references, and notes of his own that are contained on every interleaved page throughout the first section of the book.

Of all the works cited above Welchman was insistent in the Preface that after the Homilies and the Liturgy, Jewel and Nowell were the most essential for a true understanding of the Articles, for at the time they were reduced to thirty-nine in 1563 the one was a Bishop and the other was Prolocutor of the Nether House. Ffolliott seems to have taken him at his word and there are many references to these two writers, and excerpts from their works, in the notes.

The second part of the Book, printed by the Clarendon Press in 1713, consists of a *Concentus* (sic) *Veterum*, but Mr Ffolliott made no notes here. The interleaved pages are all blank and the somewhat laboured, and not always accurate, transcripts from the New Testament in the first part of the book suggests that, like some theological students to-day, he had just enough Greek for the New Testament only. Perhaps he did not go on to read for Orders and therefore concluded that this part of the book was not for him! But it is interesting to note the bibliography for this section of the book, with the editions of those patristic works[1] which were then accessible to the student and which he was expected to use.

Barnabas.	Epistola.	Oxon. 12°. 1685.
Clemens Romanus.	Epist. ad Cor.	Oxon. 12°. 1677.
Ignatius Antioch.	Epistolae.	Lond. 4to. 1680.
Justinus Martyr.	Opera.	Coloniae. Fol. 1686.
Ecclesiae Smyrniensis.	Epistola apud Euseb.	I. 4. c. 15–.
Athenagoras.	Legatio pro. Christ:	Colon. 1686.
Theophilus Antioch.	ad Autolycum.	Oxon. 12°. 1684.
Irenaeus.	Adv. Haereses.	Oxon. Fol. 1702.
Tertullianus.	Opera.	Basil. Fol. 1550.
Clemens Alexandr.	Quis dives salv.	Oxon. 12°. 1683.
Origines.	Contra Celsum.	Cantab. 4to. 1683.
Cyprianus.	Opera.	Paris. Fol. 1666.
Epistolae autem citantur juxta Editionem Oxon.		
Arnobius.	Adv. Gentes.	Paris. 1666.
Lactantius.	Opera.	Paris. 12°. 1545.

Perhaps this textbook with the notes was used by Mr Ffolliott in preparation for those "declamations" which, though not technically part of the degree course, were sometimes required to be held by the college authorities. But whether they were used for this purpose or just for his own edification, or were the result of a course of reading suggested by his tutor, it is not difficult to believe that Mr John Ffolliott of Trinity—if it was he—was a more careful and painstaking student than many of his contemporaries.

C. L. S. Linnell.

[1] It is to be noted perhaps that all the patristic evidence is taken from the second and third centuries, which is not always easily reconcilable with the sense given to the Articles.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Barkway was Bishop of St Andrews from 1938 to 1949.
The Rev. J. C. Fenton is Vicar of Wentworth, near Rotherham.
The Very Rev. F. C. Synge is Dean of George, S. Africa.
The Rev. C. L. S. Linnell is Rector of Letheringsett, Norfolk.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I am grateful to the Archdeacon of Taunton for his generous reply to my recent article on the status and ministry of women, and I welcome his agreement with me, both upon the basic principle at issue, and upon the need to set this discussion in the largest possible context. We differ, it seems, mainly in regard to the conclusions to be drawn from the Biblical passages relating to the subordination of woman; and the Archdeacon says that although I attempt to "explain away" the passages favouring the traditional view, I offer little "solid reason . . . for reaching any other conclusion".

I ought, therefore, to point out that my purpose was not to argue in detail the case against that view, but simply to ask certain pertinent questions. Limitation of space precluded any close examination of the texts, and I had to content myself with the statement of an alternative and (in my submission) more cogent interpretation, which demands more careful and impartial consideration than it has yet received. Nevertheless, I would maintain that I had suggested two very solid reasons for rejecting the theory of a divinely-ordained male "headship"—(i) the witness of the creation stories to a different conception of sexual relation from that which they have traditionally been made to support, and (ii) the fact that the theological principle of the subordination of woman so obviously depends upon an androcentric view of human relationships which we have, by social and legal reforms, admitted to be untenable, and which is false to all that is best in human experience.

If the Genesis 2 creation story is expounded from the androcentric standpoint of its author, it can certainly be made to uphold the traditional teaching. But when it is read with the later account in Genesis 1, and when the two narratives are together interpreted in the light of Biblical criticism and of new insights into the nature of personality, relation, and sex (insights, surely, which we dare not refuse to ascribe in some measure to the illumination of the Holy Spirit), I would submit that we reach an understanding of the relation of the sexes which is inimical to the traditional notion of a male "headship".

But the crux, of course, is the teaching of St Paul; and in this

matter we are asked to accept the view that his interpretation (and that of the New Testament Church) of the creation stories is infallible and determinative. It is certainly no light thing, as Archdeacon Hilder says, to set aside teaching which comes to us with such authority—yet we must ask whether it is teaching so integral to the Gospel that the most serious consequences would attend its rejection; and there can be only one answer. The subordination of woman cannot be admitted as a fundamental truth of the Christian religion.

I agree with the Archdeacon when he says, "Nobody reading 1 Corinthians 11 or Ephesians 5 could suppose that St Paul conceived himself to be starting from observed social conditions. . . ." Clearly he began from what he believed to be revealed and unassailable truth concerning sexual relation. But to recognize this is surely not inconsistent with the contention that his teaching was conditioned by an ingrained conviction that in the matter of woman's status the contemporary order of society did, in fact, accurately reflect the purpose of God in creation. Like other men of his time, St Paul would never have paused to question this; it was an assumption universally accepted as belonging to the nature of things. But this does not guarantee its theological soundness. Man is not necessarily the "head" of woman because the Apostle, in common with the law and social theory of antiquity, said that he is; and we may not improperly ask whether St Paul's understanding of the divine purpose for the sexes was not somewhat limited, in this as in other matters, by personal and contemporary factors.

Ephesians 5 naturally occupies a key place in this discussion, and I feel that the Archdeacon has hardly done justice to my article at this point in suggesting that I "strain the bounds of credulity". Indeed, he seems to have missed the main point of my argument—but perhaps this was because it was necessarily much compressed. I would have welcomed a fuller criticism than that contained in one short paragraph, for the passage in question is of crucial importance; but it would be impossible to deal shortly with all the issues involved, so I hope your readers will excuse an equally brief reply!

Since the Archdeacon finds no "positive evidence" to support my view, it is worth asking whether the traditional teaching is in fact more securely based. I have already suggested that the creation narratives, interpreted afresh, tell against it, while the Pauline material has but doubtful authority, to say the least. Where, then, do we look for positive evidence in favour of the subordination theory? Our Lord himself made no pronouncement upon the subject. "Church teaching" is suspect, because it is founded upon premises which are of dubious validity. There remains then such evidence as human nature and society afford—and this is far from conclusive.

We are on very dangerous ground if we infer that because the social, legal, and religious theories of antiquity (or of our own time) posit a male "headship", *therefore* God himself has invested the male with "headship". May it not be, as I suggested, that this androcentricity is a denial, and not an expression, of the divine purpose in creation? Furthermore, little light is thrown upon the matter by

man and woman themselves. The essence of "headship" does not appear to have been defined—and Ephesians 5 does not help us, for Christ's headship over the Church (to which the husband's is said to correspond) is connected with his being "the saviour of the body", whereas the male is in no sense the "saviour" of the female; while marriage demands a mutual and not an unilateral love and self-sacrifice. Moreover, we would assume that in investing man with "headship", God would have endowed him with the gifts necessary for its exercise; but there is no evidence that the male possesses any such specific and peculiar qualities. Granted, there are apparently certain hormonal factors characteristic of the human male, as of males among the animals, which make for sexual dominance; but dominance and "headship" are totally different things—and in human society dominance is mainly correlated with physical strength, and assumes increasingly less significance as culture advances. Of the metaphysical quality of "headship" attributed to the male by theology we have no evidence whatever; and only a very shallow logic would derive an ontological superordination from a functional dominance which is disappearing as civilization and morality progress.

Little importance can be attached to the Archdeacon's argument that marriages break down because the husband will not assume the "responsibility of 'headship' which nature requires of him". This is, of course, one of the explanations given for a very few failures—but is it ever the real cause? In such cases it is generally not "nature" but the wife who requires her husband to be "head"—and there are often psychological reasons underlying her demand: perhaps, for example, she had sought in him a substitute for a dominating father, or perhaps she had tried to evade her own marital responsibilities. But I would submit that such cases are too rare and exceptional in character to prove that the "headship" of the male is a fact, and that the married ignore it at their peril.

Clearly this discussion is only at its beginning, but if it is pursued in the spirit of the Archdeacon of Taunton's article there is good hope that it will prove both useful and enlightening. Meanwhile I am grateful to you, Sir, for opening your pages to an exchange of views which has clarified some of the points at issue in this matter, and has shown that there are many questions bearing upon the relation between the sexes which demand study. As I read the Archdeacon's conclusion, it seems to me that we are at one in desiring that serious attention should be given to practical measures designed to facilitate the development of woman's complementary ministry in the Church. If this can be accompanied by the development of a deeper sense of partnership in the common spheres of work and administration which already exist in the Church, experience may throw a good deal of light upon some of our theological problems.

Yours faithfully,

SHERWIN BAILEY.

85, FOUNTAIN ROAD,
BIRMINGHAM, 17.

MORE ABOUT PARABLES

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Some of your correspondents have been discussing to what extent Biblical thought-forms can be used to teach Biblical truths to people with a quite different set of mental images. This problem is very fully dealt with in a sixpenny pamphlet, "New Light from New Translations", recently published by the British and Foreign Bible Society from the pen of its Translations Secretary, the Rev. W. J. Bradnock.

How is one to translate "salvation" or "grace" into the language of a primitive people? What are the right words for "Holy Spirit" or even for "God"? Is a literal translation of "Your sins shall be as white as snow", or of "I am the true vine", possible for people who know neither snow nor grapes? What meaning is conveyed, when a snake happens to be a local delicacy, by the question "If your son asks for a fish, will you give him a serpent?"

Many happy solutions are recorded, and one controversy is settled by a footnote: "The story that has gained wide credence that the Eskimo version translates 'Lamb of God' by 'Little Seal' is entirely untrue." This answers the Vicar of Goathland's proper protest in your December number that, if it were so, the sacrificial significance of the lamb would be completely lost.

Yours faithfully,
R. A. YATES.

FITZ RECTORY,
SHREWSBURY.

REVISED BAPTISMAL SERVICES

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I have read with interest Mr Hickin's criticism in your December number of the baptism service for which I am responsible.

He raises a few points with which I should like to deal.

(1) The reception of the child and the signing with the cross take place immediately after the baptism at the altar. That is chiefly for the sake of convenience. In churches like mine the font is tucked away in a corner and there is not sufficient room for a dignified act of reception. That is why we process up the main aisle and receive the child at the steps of the high altar. The people can stand comfortably in the sanctuary and see what is happening.

(2) The Order of Baptism substitutes Ephesians 4. 1–6 for Mark 10. 13–16. This is deliberate. One of my chief difficulties is to persuade parents that baptism is not a mere form of blessing of children, but is admission into the Catholic Church and the beginning of a new life. If they wish me to bless their infants I am always pleased to oblige; but it is a different matter to enlist them as soldiers of Christ's

army. I think the passage from Ephesians helps to clarify this point, whereas the passage from St Mark misleads them.

(3) Mr Hickin states that there is no reference to St Paul's teaching about baptism in Romans 6. I agree with him if he means there are no specific quotations, but, at the same time, I maintain that the service itself is based on its implications.

We are always confronted with the difficulty of language. Mr Hickin thinks that Dr Major overcame it, and he quotes a passage: ". . . continually mortifying our corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living." Dr Major, Mr Hickin and I understand these words, but what on earth do they mean to Tom, Dick, and Harry? I am far from satisfied with the service I wrote fourteen years ago, but it was an attempt to avoid the impression of unreality, without jettisoning the essential truths of the Prayer Book service.

Yours faithfully,
MERVYN STOCKWOOD.

ST MATTHEW'S VICARAGE,
REDFIELD,
BRISTOL, 5.

BOOK REVIEWS

CONFIRMATION: ITS PLACE IN THE BAPTISMAL MYSTERY. By L. S. Thornton. Dacre Press. 15s.

To eat one's cake and still to have it is, so it seems, a convenience now afforded to the biblical theologian by his study of Hebrew modes of thought. Those who have studied the doctrines of the Trinity and the Two Natures of Christ are supposed to have been prepared for this, being accustomed to the complementary ideas of "interpenetration" and "appropriation". They are now asked to accept an essentially bi-polar doctrine of Christian initiation, foreshadowed in Scripture from the Creation onwards, by which the following two statements are simultaneously true:

(*a*) Christian initiation has a double character, with two poles or foci of equal importance, the laver and the "seal" (or confirmation), each carrying its proper share of the total meaning; and yet

(*b*) by interpenetration of properties the whole range of meaning may at times be applied to either pole separately (indeed, the whole may be implied in a reference either to one or other of the sacramental acts concerned or to any one aspect of the inward dispositions or motions involved in the whole, e.g. faith, remission of sins, or "the gift of the Spirit").

Dr Thornton holds that those who try to show that the laver alone constitutes the essential sacramental act of Christian initiation are misled by a Graeco-Occidental desire for logical simplicity which the Bible does not uphold. (Professor G. W. H. Lampe's thesis in *The Seal of the Spirit* receives special treatment in an Appendix.) He can

thus deal neatly with Old Testament passages linking the water theme intimately with the Spirit-gift theme. Thus too he disposes of the Johannine nexus between "water and the Spirit", Acts 2. 38 in its more obvious interpretation, and early patristic statements such as that "the seal is the water" (Hermas).

This attempt to give theological weight to contentions which the late Dom Gregory Dix brought forward on largely historical grounds does not however carry conviction, either as a whole or in detail. Confusion is created (and revealed) by the author's diverse involved and often stepwise processes of analogy and typology, even allowing for Hebrew modes of thought. A few out of many instances must suffice. It is not feasible to compare, as Dr Thornton does, the creation of Adam in two stages (plasmic moulding, Gen. 2. 6, and in-breathing, 2. 7) with Christian initiation in two phases, the earlier of which (regeneration) surely has more in common with the later stage of Adam's creation than with the earlier. Nor is it in the interests of a clear unravelling of baptismal doctrine to divide our Lord's life on earth into (*a*) incarnation with first operation of the Spirit, human growth and baptism (and so to the Cross and Resurrection) and (*b*) second operation of the Spirit after the baptism, equipping for the mission of Servant-Son now deliberately accepted. Nor again can we follow all the way in describing the creation of the Church as two-fold, involving a structural or stoichiometric formation in virtue of the Cross-Resurrection-Ascension (possibly with the Insufflation as the corresponding Spirit-operation), and as the second phase a functional endowment associated with Pentecost.

The use made of Justin Martyr's treatment of Joshua 5, in relation to the New Circumcision or Sealing, might have been more impressive if it could have been limited to the simple laver-seal issue, although even then it would not have been decisive in respect of theory or practice in Justin's day, still less in the Apostolic Age. As it is, with a threefold or fourfold initiatory pattern also to be considered (Ezekiel 36. 25–27 is brought in here), the reader's willingness to struggle with the simpler issue is hard to sustain.

Here and throughout the book the question presents itself to the mind, Why a two-phase initiation complex rather than a three- or a four-phase one? "Hebrew thought" would allow a more elaborate pattern, patristic practice would easily suggest one, and Scriptural data (not least the sequence Cross-Resurrection-Ascension-Pentecost) could be adduced without difficulty.

However, the live issue is between Prof. Lampe's single-phase view and Dr Thornton's two-phase view. The latter's book does not encourage the hesitant reader to veer in his direction. Anyone who has not hitherto been able to envisage the status of baptized but unconfirmed Christians as one of stoichiometric but not yet dynamic incorporation into the Body of Christ will not be enabled readily to do so by this volume. Rather will he feel that the author is as much at the mercy of a form of logic as he supposes his opponents to be. Dr Thornton writes: "As the Spirit in the church is complementary to the Christ, so is confirmation the complement of baptism." No! The

Spirit is not merely complementary to the Christ. He is the bearer of the Christ to the Church, as he is conversely of the Bride to the Lamb. In whatever sense, degree, or measure the Spirit does not dwell in us, in the same sense, degree and measure the Christ also does not dwell in us, nor we in him.

JOHN C. SLADDEN.

TODWICK RECTORY,
SHEFFIELD.

THE NEW BIBLE COMMENTARY. Edited by F. Davidson, A. M. Stibbs and E. F. Kevan. Inter-Varsity Fellowship. 35s.

A glance at the list of contributors to this handsomely produced volume shows that no effort has been spared to find suitable writers. A reviewer of these 1,200 pages may perhaps be forgiven for turning first to discover the latest comments of this school of thought on certain notorious points. "The Genesis account of creation is not cast into scientific form, and *this is one of the chief marks of its divine inspiration*" (p. 76a; italics mine). Cain married one of Adam's daughters (p. 82a). Perhaps Joshua did not make the sun stand still; it may have been that in the darkness of the hail-storm the sun seemed not "to come" (p. 231b). (The interpretation of the incident here given seems to have much in common with that put forward by the Roman Catholic scholar van Hoonacker in an article in *The Expositor*, November 1916. But the Minister of Ballymoney Church (Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland) here makes the astonishing statement that "the word translated 'go down'" (בוא) "only once, in Gen. 28. 11, has the meaning 'set'". My Hebrew lexicon gives seventeen other examples of this meaning, including one in verse 27 of Joshua 10.) All the same the contributor thinks it necessary to point out to his readers "that one is not disparaging the miraculous nature of the occurrence by suggesting that there was a less spectacular divine intervention". Such readers will be glad to know that the commentator on Jonah inclines to the view that the prophet was swallowed by a whale, albeit the sperm whale "which does not have the narrowness of throat of the true whale"; although "the information that Jonah was incarcerated for three days and three nights, if intended literally, is not likely to have been supplied by Jonah himself, who, even had he been conscious for the whole time, would hardly have had any means of marking the passage of time" (p. 716b). Coming to the New Testament we find that the traditional authorship of Matthew is confirmed (p. 771a) by the occurrence in 9. 10 of *ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ*, a phrase best translated "at home" [Why?]. Mark 2. 15 makes it clear [?] that the feast took place in Levi's (Matthew's) house. "Here, therefore, is a phrase that betrays the identity of the author" [!]. Jude is later than 2 Peter (p. 1144b), and Jude 17 endorses the latter "as being apostolic and likewise canonical". (One has a suspicion that if only the book of Enoch were included in the Old Testament, verse 14 would be found to prove that Enoch was canonical too.)

The old bogies are here too. G. W. Bromiley is at first worried because "the Roman Catholic seems to adopt a position very much like the orthodox one" (p. 19a), but, he finds, the Roman Church includes the Old Testament Apocrypha as scripture. Roman Catholics may be glad to note the view of this writer that Roman Catholic teaching "is likely to prove more lasting than the liberal view which now claims so much attention and which superficially appears to be more dangerous". Again, on p. 1128a, we read: "There is no justification here for the *vicious practice* of auricular confession" (italics mine).

While such quotations are representative of much contained in this volume, there are articles of more sober scholarship. In particular there is F. F. Bruce's article on the Fourfold Gospel (pp. 58–63) (in contrast to the author of the commentary on Matthew he appears to accept a "conservative-critical" account of the Gospel origins). Again, there is J. H. S. Burleigh's article on the Primitive Church (pp. 64–67). The commentary on the Psalms admits various authors, except in those cases where Davidic authorship is "maintained in the New Testament" (p. 491a), while even in the writings of the more adamant fundamentalists we find phrases like: "It must however be readily admitted that the great preponderance of critical opinion . . ." (p. 560a). Possible textual corruptions in the O.T. are posited on the grand scale (p. 340a), and we are reminded that "numbers from a thousand upwards were used not merely as round figures but also hyperbolically" (p. 340b). However, hyperbole is apparently not allowed as an explanation of the great ages of the patriarchs (p. 82b). On p. 766b we have some wise words: our Lord's identification of Elijah with John the Baptist "shows that the words of prophecy must not be taken too literally".

Undoubtedly the continued publication of such volumes as the present is caused by a deep desire to invest the Bible with a decisive and fixed authority such that the common reader may be saved from being at the mercy of either the official interpretations of a hierarchy or the often changing findings of scholarship. That is why there is an anxiety to come to such conclusions as: "God raised up a race of men whom he *specially inspired* to record for the benefit of mankind his *special revelation* . . . we are justified in holding that the quality and intensity of inspiration granted to the Apostles will not be repeated" (p. 29a; italics original). But unfortunately things are as God has disposed them and not as we think they ought to be. If we could accept the Bible as plenarily inspired, there would still be, as there always has been, uncertainty about its exact interpretation. (Such an article as A. M. Stibbs' Appendix on the "Warning Passages" in Hebrews, pp. 1116–1117, with its frequent alternative interpretations, makes this clear, as does indeed the very existence of this or any commentary.) But, more serious, some of us cannot accept the plenary inspiration of the Bible just because to do so means having recourse to the sort of arguments found in this commentary, and we would rather lay the difficulties and contradictions contained in the Bible at the door of the fallible human beings of imperfect understanding through whom God has not disdained to give us this written

revelation, than at the door of omnipotent and omniscient God himself. There is the hint of a glimmering understanding of this attitude, on p. 22b, but unfortunately it remains a hint: "A true doctrine of history and revelation in the Bible will be formulated only when the problem is studied in the light of the similar problem of the Incarnation. In Christ, the Word revealed, there are two: the divine and the human; the revelation and the history; and these two are distinct and yet one. So too it is in the Word written, which is the witness to Christ. It is not enough to deny the divine, to see only a man here, a book there. But it is also not enough to ignore the human, to see only a God here, an oracle there."

Selwyn College,
Cambridge.

E. L. Randall.

Le Problème de Jésus. By Jean Guitton. Aubier. 2 vols. 1080 frs.

The work of Jean Guitton is not unknown in this country, but it ought to be better known. A confirmed Anglophile, M. Guitton has, in particular, a deep and sympathetic understanding of the spirituality and traditions of the English Church. A Catholic of unimpeachable orthodoxy, his many publications reveal a breadth of outlook, a quality of liberality and tact, a precision and grace of statement, and an absence of sectarian *parti pris*, that are characteristic of what is best in French scholarship. His intense concern for Church unity goes back to his student days.

M. Guitton is now in his fifties. Born at Saint-Étienne, he passed from his local *lycée* to the famous *École normale*. As *professeur agrégé* in philosophy he taught successively at the *lycées* of Troyes, Moulins and Lyon. He gained his doctorate in 1933 with treatises on Plotinus and St Augustine and on Newman, in which he discussed the problems of time and the historical process and of existence and development in relation to Catholic Christianity—problems which in the last twenty years have figured prominently in philosophical and theological debate. Imprisoned during the war, he spent the time as best he could in preparing the considerable body of literary work that has since been published. In 1950 he was appointed to the professorship at the University of Dijon which he still holds. Recently he was awarded the Grand Prix de Littérature by the French Academy. His masters in philosophy were Bergson, Blondel and Chevallier, though perhaps the most persistent and pervasive influence has been that of Newman. Certainly he does not belong to the contemporary Thomist following. By temperament he is not a dogmatist or rigorist, nor does his thought take naturally to a systematic form. He is not, in fact, a "pure" metaphysician in the sense of being a specialist in abstract thinking, and his literary ability would qualify him as *un homme de lettres*. Not that there is anything of the dilettante or mere *vulgarisateur* about him. Such works as *Justification du Temps* and *L'Existence temporelle* must be read with an alert mind. His

university courses include lectures on modern logic and scientific method.

The present volumes are part of a large-scale enterprise in apologetics entitled "La Pensée moderne et le Catholicisme", the first part of which appeared some years before the war and which remains to be completed. The author believes that the fundamental problem of Christianity occurs at the junction of philosophy and history, as indeed the dogma of the Incarnation demonstrates. Accordingly he has set out to discover and render explicit his deepest reasons for belief both as a philosopher and as a historian. The work is thus as much a personal confession of faith as a scheme of intellectual propaganda. It is—as with Newman himself and as with Pascal—this personal approach which gives fertility, freshness, and, I would say, cogency to the argumentation. The first section of the apology—"cours de philosophie religieuse à l'usage moderne", the author would prefer to call it—deals with Faith and Intelligence and is devoted to preliminary questions posed by criticism in both philosophy and history. It centres upon a carefully drawn antithesis of Renan and Newman. The second part, Jesus and Thought, raises the problem of religious knowledge and in particular our knowledge of the Jesus of history. The third, the Church and History, is concerned with the historical development of the Gospel.

M. Guitton was at one time a pupil of Lagrange at Jerusalem and is suitably qualified to undertake the difficult and much-laboured task upon which he embarks. He approaches it from the standpoint of the non-believer and endeavours in face of a searching scepticism to reconstruct the essential facts. It is impossible in a brief review to summarize, still less to criticize, the sustained argument of over 500 pages of close type. These volumes, like most of the writer's work with which I am acquainted, call for attentive reading. The first is mainly concerned with the Biblical evidence and its reliability. Negative theories are examined, to be rejected, the apologist's own aim being rather to provide Biblical criticism with what it has usually lacked, a comprehensive *rationale* or philosophy. The second volume gets to grips with the two basic issues: in what sense is Christ divine, in what sense is the Resurrection a fact? Here faith, metaphysics and history converge to pose a vital problem.

English readers will probably prefer to tackle M. Guitton's work in the abridged translation which has just made its appearance. But those who may already be acquainted with the author's other publications in the series will doubtless wish to venture upon the original. It is the work of a writer whom it is at any rate a pleasure to read. In addition to analytical contents tables there is a full *Index des idées*.

B. M. G. Reardon.

Kelly Rectory,
Lifton.

INTRODUCTORY PAPERS ON DANTE. By Dorothy L. Sayers. Methuen. 21s.

"The Commedia will always be a hard and trying book," observed Dean Church, in his essay on Dante, "nor did the writer much care that it should be otherwise." It is not that Dante wrote obscurely; the difficulty lies elsewhere. A certain spiritual maturity is needed to cope with any christian allegory. A boy who reads *Pilgrim's Progress*, for example, may enjoy it as an adventure story, and yet on the whole feel disappointed and put off. A similar fate may overtake the student of Dante, and for the same reason. Unable to resist his author—entranced by the outward form of the book, without apprehending its inward and spiritual meaning—he may well be weary among its splendours, like a dull visitor to a cathedral, bored by magnificence.

In these papers, the first of two projected series, Dr Sayers sets out to remove some difficulties from the path of modern readers. We are all, nowadays, somewhat literal and prosaic, unaccustomed to think or express ourselves in symbols. This cast of mind, congenial to scientific thought, hinders the appreciation both of religion and poetry, and is therefore specially inimical to the understanding of a religious poem. In forty-odd pages on imagery, Dr Sayers helps us to overcome it. Again, many readers are put off, as Dante's contemporaries were not, by the medieval christian scheme of the fate of souls after death, lodged in Hell, Purgatory, or Heaven. Yet this is the setting of the poem. Its literal meaning, as Dante himself says in his letter to Can Grande, is the state of departed souls. Some knowledge of the medieval scheme is evidently needed for the appreciation of his work.

Worse still, from the point of view of the modern reader, is the allegorical character of the poem. Students of theology may be expected to know that Aquinas interpreted the Scriptures in four senses—the literal, the allegorical, the moral, and the anagogical. But when we are confronted with a poet who constructs his poem with the intention that it should be interpreted in these four ways, there is work to do for the ordinary reader who wants to know what his author is after. Dr Sayers is ready to help, and she helps very well. Following Dante's own indication, given in the letter quoted above, that the allegorical signification of his poem is concerned with the behaviour of man in this life "according as by good or ill deserving in the exercise of his free will he becomes liable to punishing or rewarding justice", she shows how the whole of the Inferno exposes the evil latent in the human heart. This chapter, entitled the City of Dis, is the best part of the book. The later chapters on the humour and paradox of the Comedy are not so helpful.

Those who know the writings of the late Charles Williams will be familiar with the notion that romantic love may mediate the vision of God. Dr Sayers follows him in claiming that this is what happened to Dante. Beatrice was the young woman with whom he fell in love when he saw her walking in the streets of Florens. The blinding flash of that experience, never forgotten in his later years, is the

personal and historical point of departure for his poem. Perhaps those who have felt something like it will in the long run be best able to understand him; and if they want some help over the initial hurdles, they could hardly do better than read Dr Sayers.

A. C. SCUPHOLME.

THURCASTON.

STUDIES IN LITERATURE AND BELIEF. By Martin Jarrett-Kerr. Rockliff. 15s.

Fr Martin Jarrett-Kerr has previously shown himself to be a literary critic. There should be no need to make allowances for him as there might be for some theologians venturing into the criticism of art. In literary studies of D. H. Lawrence and François Mauriac[1] he showed his professional competence, and in a long review article[2] in an academic literary periodical he attempted with breadth, sensitivity, and courage, to appraise the work of Dr F. R. Leavis, one of the greatest critics of our day, and, moreover, disagreed with some of it. Dr Leavis's reply[3] accused him of "a deflecting preoccupation" with Christianity which, he maintained, distorted some of his literary judgments. But, even supposing that there were such a deflection, it is obvious that it could not be of a simple, moral sort, since Fr Jarrett-Kerr almost tumbles over himself to promote the cause of Lawrence, the pagan, while he has only a very few kind words to say for Mauriac, the Roman Catholic. Commenting on the debate, the editor of the periodical, Mr F. W. Bateson, wrote,[4] "Unlike Dr Leavis I had been both surprised and impressed by the minuteness of the critical deflection that Fr Jarrett-Kerr's Anglo-Catholicism seemed to impose." Fr Jarrett-Kerr has been, then, in the literary world generally well thought of.

In his latest literary work, *Studies in Literature and Belief*, he has included detailed studies of the old ballads and of Calderon, Manzoni, Dostoevsky, and Ramuz, between a general introductory essay on "The Literary Margins of Belief" and a final essay called "Pilgrims or Explorers", in which he is concerned to maintain that "Faith is . . . an incentive to exploration" (p.184) and need not constrict and insensitize the literary artist. In this last essay he also passes incidental judgment on, for example, Mr Graham Greene, Franz Kafka, and Mr E. M. Forster.

In the introductory essay he claims that it is impossible to discuss even the work of Henry James (lacking though he is, for the most part, in any apparent religious reference) apart from the "history of Western thought; thought about man and about history which has

---

[1] *D. H. Lawrence and Human Existence*, by Father William Tiverton, with a foreword by T. S. Eliot. (London: Rockliff, 1951.) *François Mauriac*. (Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1954.)

[2] "The Literary Criticism of F. R. Leavis." *Essays in Criticism*, ii (1952). 351–68.

[3] "The State of Criticism: Representations to Fr Martin Jarrett-Kerr." *Essays in Criticism*, iii (1953). 215–33.

[4] Ibid., 234.

been profoundly affected by its roots in Christian doctrine" (p. 15). He is prepared, then, to spread his net very wide for specimens of an interesting relationship between literature and belief. And he says that since the relationship between Western thought and Christian doctrine "has differed at different times . . . we can see that it is impossible to discuss, simply and univocally, 'the relationship of belief to literature'. Since there have been so many relationships the only way of discussing them is historical" (p. 15). He is aware that in so doing he may be evading the effort to make a general assessment of the relationship. In this he has all my sympathy, for it is a question that has agitated some of the best literary critics of our day. Mr T. S. Eliot himself, for example, has felt able to make only a few observations which, though most illuminating, are but incidental.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Fr Jarrett-Kerr's treatment is scrappy and somewhat adventitious. Both the book as a whole and the individual essays lack coherence, and it is often difficult to grasp the author's point among the many long quotations and kaleidoscopic references. There is little rigorous argument and much reliance is put on other critics (cf. especially the essays on Calderon and Dostoevsky). Occasionally Fr Jarrett-Kerr makes high-handed judgments which are, in character, a little too like those of Dr Leavis. Referring to Thomas Mann, he throws out as he passes, unargued, the comment that he is "the only great living" novelist (p. 178).

Fr Jarrett-Kerr's range is wide, and that may be one reason why this is not a thorough book. Where there is a more careful analysis it is sometimes a little mechanical and thin (cf. pp. 74–5). It is a pity that the author has not again shown himself using the current coin of the professional critic with that technical ability that has been a fair example to all Christians trying to make their faith articulate in the terms of their own job.

R. T. Davies.

Liverpool University.

SHORTER NOTICES

Oral Tradition. By Eduard Nielsen. S.C.M. Press. 7s.

The Rise of the Prophets. By N. J. Bull. Religious Education Press. 7s. 6d.

Job and his Friends. By T. H. Robinson. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

Nielsen's important book, the eleventh in the "Studies in Biblical Theology", is mainly a translation of his recent articles in *Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift*, and is to be welcomed because it presents in English the standpoint and methods of the Scandinavian traditio-historical school represented by Engnell, over against the older literary critical school. It also clarifies Engnell's position in relation to those, such as Wellhausen, Gunkel and Lods, who combine the documentary hypothesis with the acceptance of the fact of oral tradition by restricting the latter to the pre-literary stage, a restriction

which Engnell holds obscures its role in ancient cultures. Again, within the Scandinavian school itself it explains the principles which lead Engnell to more conservative conclusions than Mowinckel. The latter's judgment in *Jesaja-disiplene* (1926) that during the oral period the disciples modified the prophets' oracles in an optimistic direction ignores Engnell's principle of the unity, at least ideological, between master and pupils.

Nielsen's argument against the Israelite use of writing for religious as opposed to practical purposes is not convincing in view of the proximity of Ras Shamra. But the general argument that the role of oral tradition was greater and more intricate than has been thought is impressive, and the conservative conclusions following from the application of its criteria, which Nielsen describes, show that many of the hitherto generally accepted conclusions of literary criticism will have to be argued on different lines if they are to remain. This is clearly seen in the treatment of three passages fundamental to the latter position. Jeremiah 36, Duhm's main evidence that the prophets wrote their oracles, is convincingly interpreted by Nielsen as evidence that writing was not the normal prophetic practice. Micah 4–5, held since Marti to be not authentic because it contradicts Micah's authentic message of doom and Jeremiah's estimate of him, is shown by the criteria of oral tradition to be genuine. As for Gen. 6–9, instead of "an artless patchwork" and the numerous redactors required to save the documentary hypothesis, Nielsen finds here a theological, literary, and chronological unity, that requires and deserves closer study.

With *The Rise of the Prophets* one is back in the school of the development of Israel's religion from which the Scandinavians are endeavouring to rescue us. The book, however, gives the teacher, for whom it is intended, interesting lessons and practical ideas.

Job and his Friends, which is much to be commended, provides a valuable critical and devotional study of the book of Job. Dr Robinson suggests that four attempts to solve the problem of suffering are examined by the poet. The answer of the oriental mind given in the prose framework, that suffering is the test of sincerity and to be accepted without question, is shown to be compatible more with omnipotence than with divine justice. The poet's treatment of the orthodox Jewish explanation given by Job's friends that pain is the result of sin, which repentance will allay, is a *reductio ad absurdum* of Jewish orthodoxy. Job's own answer is interpreted here as a dim belief in immortality, the necessary inference from personal acquaintance with God in this life. The final answer is that the solution of the problem of undeserved suffering is given not by the explanations of orthodoxy but in personal encounter with God—"I had heard of thee by the hearing of the ears, but now mine eye seeth thee".

B. N. Y. Vaughan.

St David's College,
Lampeter.

ST SERGIUS IN PARIS: THE ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE. By Donald A. Lowrie. S.P.C.K. 15s.

Most Anglicans, or at least most readers of THEOLOGY, will be familiar with the name of the St Sergius Theological Institute, if only from the writings of some of its more eminent professors. This is the first time that the full story of the Institute has been told, and Dr Lowrie, who for many years has been its guide, counsellor, and friend, is of all men the most qualified to tell it.

Three things immediately strike one about the story of St Sergius. First, the remarkable insight that it gives into the hopes, fears, and triumphs of the Russian *diaspora*. Secondly, it is an amazing achievement in Christian co-operation. Its foundation would have been impossible without the aid of Christians of other Churches, and notably of John R. Mott, while throughout its history it has been dependent upon the willing generosity of other Churches, among which the Anglican holds an honoured place. The Institute has readily repaid this generosity not only by the key place, from the Orthodox side, that it has taken in the whole Ecumenical Movement, but also in making itself one of the most attractive ecumenical meeting-places in Christendom. Thirdly, one is struck by the very high standard of academic attainment which has been maintained throughout. It is unfortunate that only a fraction of this attainment is available to those who do not read Russian; a glance at Dr Lowrie's bibliography makes one hope that much more of it will soon be translated.

We have found two minor errors of fact: Paris is in the Anglican Diocese of London, not Gibraltar, and Mgr Rupp is Vicar-General of Paris, not Co-adjutor.

HENRY R. T. BRANDRETH, O.G.S.

PARIS.

SPIRITUAL GUIDANCE. By Shirley Hughson. Mowbrays. 12s. 6d.

This, clearly, is a book for priests and pastors. But since it contains a complete treatise on the spiritual life, others will appreciate its contents. There are sections on the obligation of perfection; the nature of sin; meditation, affective and contemplative prayer; distraction, dryness, mortification; and a longer section on the Eucharist and its place in the spiritual life. Father Hughson has at his disposal experience, wisdom, and a deep and wide knowledge of spiritual writings.

Those whose minds do not move step by step within a system may need some patience. But patience will be repaid—even if we do not accept the necessity for spiritual direction in every soul. Nor should we be dismayed by the gravity which system seems to lend to the task of perfection: the "earnest desire" for advance that is necessary: the "assiduous study of the method and operation of the Holy Spirit" that is imperative: the reminder that prayer is a solemn thing, not to be lightly approached. The simplicity and delight of prayer is there as well: but we need to read the book thoroughly, so that we

can stand back from the system and see how deep must be the experience which enables the author to move within it with sure and unerring step.

HEATHER WILEMAN.

ST CHRISTOPHER'S COLLEGE,
BLACKHEATH.

GROWING SPIRITUALLY. By E. Stanley Jones. Hodder and Stoughton. 9s. 6d.

The author, in his introduction, expresses surprise at failure to find books dealing explicitly with spiritual growth. This surprise indicates what some may feel to be an unfortunate emphasis in a book which contains some sound observations about the things that stunt our growth; much sympathy for human suffering and weakness; and a manifest devotion to our Lord. The book tends to be so self-conscious about growth and maturity that we are in danger of letting it become an idol. It is true that the author stresses the need for shifting the emphasis from ourselves to God; and that he reminds his readers that Christianity is neither a healing cult nor a happiness cult. But the presentation of the material, set out in portions for every day of the year, leaves us with the impression of a 365 days' spiritual cure: an impression that is heightened by the apparent rapidity with which our spiritual clean-up is effected: a rapidity not borne out by experience, where psychological peculiarities sometimes remain as a cross. Whilst we are impressed with the faith and sincerity of the author, we are left hungry for real devotional food: for God-centred prayers and affirmations for the day, so that growth again takes its natural place, and a generation only too absorbed in its own health or disease can be encouraged to turn to the mysterious being of God.

HEATHER WILEMAN.

PSYCHOLOGY WITHOUT TEARS. By William A. O'Connor. Rider and Co. 12s. 6d.

Dr O'Connor is an experienced practising psychiatrist, and this popular exposition of his subject is a good deal better than its banal title would lead one to expect. While his survey of the subject is purposely light—a series of informative talks with plenty of illustrative case-material—he seems also to have a shrewd sense of the kind of curiosity which provides a market for elementary introductions to psychology, and treats it with a discourse that should disturb nobody and may even be mildly psycho-therapeutic in effect. His teaching is eclectic, though it gives pride of place to Freudian doctrine—the sections on this meta-psychology might almost have been subtitled "Freud without Fears". He gives a brief outline of the evolution of modern psychological studies, including a glimpse of the new para-psychological theories and the phenomena they deal with; he recounts (not very usefully) a few inexplicable Oriental fakir-

phenomena, and ends with general remarks upon the application of psychology to individual and social living. For readers who want to know a little about what the psychologists are doing, who are not unduly anxious about themselves and had better not be made so, the book may serve better than some others of the same kind. Pity it is not just a little more systematic. The bibliography is very short and seems rather haphazard; but it is interesting to note its inclusion of Dr Reinhold Niebuhr's *Nature and Destiny of Man.*

LONDON. PHILIP MAIRET.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE REFORMATION. By Sydenham B. Lindsay. A. H. Stockwell. 2s. 6d.

This brief pamphlet, originally delivered as a lecture, contains a great deal of material and useful information without becoming the recital of a string of facts. The style is lively and many of the main features of the subject receive attention.

There are a few over-dogmatic statements and the paragraph concerning the consecration of Matthew Parker is obscure except to those who know something of the points at issue. Also, when Canon Lindsay says that Mary Tudor was merciless to Cranmer he should have added to the reasons which he gives that the Archbishop was the embodiment of all that the Queen hated.

The lecture will serve as a useful introduction to the events and objects of the movement.

VANCOUVER, CANADA. H. F. WOODHOUSE.

LA CONFESSION. By Max Thurian. Delachaux et Niestlé. Frs. 5.90.

The religious community of Taizé, in the French Reformed Church, has already struck Anglicans as a significant development in a church with a Calvinistic tradition. (For their ideals see especially the work of the prior, Roger Schutz, *Introduction à la vie communautaire,* 1944). Pastor Max Thurian, a member of the community, who has already published a work on the relation of spirituality to the liturgical life, now writes a plea for a more common practice of voluntary confession and spiritual direction. He supports his plea with the relevant extracts from Calvin and Luther, though he holds, with Luther and against Calvin, that confession is "a sacrament" and that Calvin's refusal to allow it that title was the product of too narrow a definition of the term *sacrament.* Nevertheless, he fully maintains Calvin's emphasis that the sacrament is inseparable from the proclamation of the Word and from faith, and that "it is always to faith that God answers in the sacrament".

CAMBRIDGE. W. O. CHADWICK.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON